DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 444 SP 035 838

AUTHOR	Messner, Kyle Ann
TITLE	Multicultural Infusion in Teacher Education: Teacher Educator Voices.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Pluralism; *Definitions; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; Interviews; *Multicultural Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Schools of Education; State Universities; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS	*Diversity (Student)

ABSTRACT

Twenty professors who teach courses required for elementary certification at two state universities in southwestern United States were interviewed regarding the preparation of preservice teachers for diversity in classrooms, using a semistructured interview protocol. Transcripts of the interviews were reviewed, looking for definitions of multiculturalism, approaches to multicultural education, and the referent groups included in definitions. Interview data were also analyzed inductively using open coding. Four assertions emerged from the data: (1) multiculturalism may be included in the curriculum under a different term or through the use of different language; (2) when teacher educators address multiculturalism, the referent groups which they include in their coursework reflect the diversity of the local area; (3) teacher educators address multiculturalism from various levels of involvement; and (4) there appears to be a perception that multiculturalism stands for difference only. Teacher educators' perceptions of multiculturalism were global and reflected a human relations approach to multiculturalism, which includes looking at similarities and differences, getting to know oneself, and addressing stereotypes and prejudices. The interview protocol is appended. (Contains 44 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

3P

Multicultural Infusion in Teacher Education: Teacher Educator Voices

Kyle Ann Messner
Appalachian State University

ED 380 444

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Messner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Running head: TEACHER EDUCATOR VOICES

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP035838

Abstract

This is a report of the data from the first phase of a two-phase study which focuses on teacher educators' perceptions and beliefs regarding multiculturalism and its inclusion into teacher education. One of the purposes of the first phase of the study was to 1) elicit and describe the spoken beliefs professors of education hold about multiculturalism, and 2) determine the goals and 3) scope of their definitions of multicultural education. Twenty professors who teach courses required for elementary certification at two state universities in the Southwest were interviewed using a semi-structured interview protocol. The data was first analyzed with three questions then analyzed using open coding (Strauss, 1988) to develop assertions which may be present in the data. A wide range of personal diversity was found in the sample of participants. Preliminary findings also indicate that teacher educators' perceptions of multiculturalism are global and reflect a human relations approach to multiculturalism. The number and type of referent groups used in their approaches to multiculturalism reflected the groups in the state. Four developing assertions are also offered.

Introduction

During the past decade and a half there has been a concerted effort on the part of most colleges of education to address the increasing diversity in our nation. Besides an increase in the recruitment of faculty and students of color, these efforts can be seen in several areas of the curriculum. At many of the schools, new departments and programs have been established, efforts have been made to place preservice teachers in more diverse field placements and teacher educators who teach the more traditional methods and foundation courses have been actively encouraged or required to change their syllabi and course content.

Most influential in the mandates for the changes has been the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (Gollnick, 1992). In 1979 NCATE developed standards which required any college of education seeking accreditation to address multiculturalism in all areas of teacher preparation. Some universities responded to the mandates for inclusion of multiculturalism in the curriculum by adding a course in multicultural education. Although the field of multicultural education provides theory and content to aid in the inclusion of a multicultural perspective into the curriculum, a course in that alone was not what the original authors of the early NCATE standards advocated. They based the role which multicultural education should play in teacher education on an earlier document "No One Model American": "Multicultural education programs for teachers are more than special courses or special learning experiences grafted onto a standard program. The commitment to cultural pluralism must permeate all areas of the educational experience provided for prospective teachers" (AACTE, 1972). Based on such a premise, this would call for the redesigning of curriculum in all courses to reflect a commitment to education which is multicultural.

Despite mandates, there have been problems with the incorporation of multiculturalism into teacher education. Of the first fifty-nine institutions seeking accreditation under the current NCATE standards, only eight (13.6 per cent) of the institutions were found in full compliance with multicultural education requirements (Gollnick, 1992). Some of the findings of the Board of Examiners related directly to the curriculum of the professional studies. Fourteen citations were given for a lack of emphasis on studies or experiences related to culturally diverse or exceptional populations; multicultural experiences were limited. Thirteen citations were given for curriculum lacking content and experiences in global and/or multicultural perspectives (Gollnick, 1992).

The NCATE findings are not the only documentation of lack of inclusion. Teacher educators themselves indicate there are problems. A survey of the membership of the Association of Teacher Educators (Buttery, Haberman, and Houston, 1990) indicated that the respondents were sensitive to the need to prepare teachers to teach in a multiethnic and multicultural settings. The 944 respondents generally did not believe however that current programs accomplish this.

This paper focuses on one small but major part of the inclusion of multiculturalism in teacher education -- the perceptions of professors who teach and are responsible for changing the content of methods, foundations and educational psychology courses. It reports the thoughts and spoken beliefs of twenty teacher educators regarding the preparation of preservice teachers for diversity in classrooms. The data for this paper was collected in the first phase of a larger ethnographic study which focuses on teacher educators' perceptions and beliefs regarding multiculturalism and its inclusion into teacher education. The purpose of this paper is describe the spoken beliefs the professors in the study hold about multiculturalism, about the goals of including it in the curriculum, and number of referent groups they include under the rubric of multicultural education.

A conceptual framework of curriculum will be described along with a brief examination of the literature which relates to the interaction of teachers' perceptions with curriculum. A review of the literature regarding the definitions of multiculturalism, the debate over the inclusiveness of referent groups and the multiple approaches to multicultural education will also be examined. Finally the data from the cross-sectional interview survey of twenty teacher educators will be reported.

Curricular framework

When examining curriculum and looking at the inclusion of a concept such as multiculturalism, a conceptual framework for curriculum is necessary. John Goodlad (1977) proposes a conceptual framework for curriculum composed of five separate levels. The first level is the "ideal curriculum", the curriculum a group of theorists, researchers, agencies or interest groups proposes as desirable. The next level is the "formal curriculum", which are the proposals of governing bodies, either state departments of education, or on the tertiary level, colleges of education. Next on Goodlad's list is the "perceived curriculum." This would be what teachers understand or believe the mandated "formal curriculum" to be. The "operational level" of the curriculum is what the teacher then attempts to teach in the classroom. The last level is the "experiential curriculum." This is what students perceive is being offered to them. In Goodlad's (1984) large scale study of K-12 schools, a lack of parallelism was found between what ideal goal statements convey and what his team of researchers observed in actual classrooms (p.235-236).

This model provides a useful lens to examine a teacher education curriculum where multiculturalism is incorporated. It breaks the curriculum down in a way that allows for an examination of what is occurring at different times along the theory-to-practice continuum. The ideal curriculum is reflected in the theory of multicultural education as outlined in the statement of the commission on Multicultural Education of AACTE: "The commitment to cultural pluralism must permeate all areas of the educational experience provided for prospective teachers." (AACTE, 1972) and in the theory of Education which is Multicultural (EMC) proposed by Carl Grant (1978). The formal curriculum would be the response of the colleges of education to the ideal curriculum. This would be found in mission statements and lists of required courses. The perceived curriculum and the experiential curriculum are both dependent on teacher educators within colleges of education. This perception is revealed in their stated beliefs, the textbooks and readings they choose and the goal statements in their syllabi. Research has shown that there is a link between what an educator believes and what is actually operationalized in the classroom. What is actually said and done in the classroom in the name of multiculturalism represents the operational curriculum. Finally, the experiential curriculum is what the students derive from the operational level. It involves what they actually experience, not only through what is said or modeled about multiculturalism, but also by what is omitted.

Importance of the Interaction of Teacher Perceptions or Beliefs With Curriculum

Perception is a fuzzy concept at times which is frequently linked to the concept of beliefs (Pajares, 1992). Beliefs rather than facts form the basis of perception (Merriam, 1988 p. 17). The importance of educators' perceptions and beliefs in regard to curriculum have been documented in the teacher belief literature. Wide variations in teachers' belief systems has been documented within a sample of teachers who shared a commitment to a particular curriculum (Bussis et al., 1976). This wide variability in belief systems has been documented in two other studies (Munby, 1984; Olsen, 1981) along with the manner of curriculum modification teachers made to match those belief systems. More recent studies (Hollingsworth, 1989; Richardson, 1990) reinforce this implication that the way teachers

adapt or adopt new practices in their classrooms relates to whether their beliefs match assumptions inherent in the curriculum. All of these studies support the notion that when a curricular, organizational, or instructional change takes place, teachers' belief systems can be ignored only at the innovator's peril.

Problems of Definition, Inclusion and Goals

The incorporation of multiculturalism into curriculum at any level however, is not easy: the language of multiculturalism is not always clear; definitions and approaches to multicultural education vary; goals are not universally agreed upon. This makes curricular change difficult. According to Sleeter and Grant (1994), this general lack of agreement in both language and the subsequent diversity in practice is due in part to educators responding to "different issues in different schools, employing different conceptual views of school and society, and holding somewhat different visions of the good society "(p. 33). A brief review of the variety of definitions and approaches to multicultural education will give the reader a glimpse of the problem.

Definitions of Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism is a term that has developed out of the literature which relates to cultural pluralism. It is very difficult to pinpoint where or when the term multiculturalism came into use. It is also very hard to distinguish the differences between the terms multiculturalism and cultural pluralism, and it is beyond the scope of this study to do so. For the purpose of this study the term multiculturalism is being used synonymously with the term cultural pluralism.

Cultural pluralism is a term which "everyone understands in a general sort of way but few people care to define precisely" (Smith, 1969 as cited in Gibson, 1976). It is important to the discussion of multicultural education because the concept of cultural pluralism is usually taken to be the fundamental basis for multicultural education. Baptiste (1977) went so far as to define multicultural education as the institutionalization of the concept of cultural pluralism in the schools.

According to Gibson (1976), some of the earlier writers saw cultural pluralism as an ideal toward which social action should be directed or as a philosophy of "equalitarian pluralism" which could be "an approach to social organization .... and as a possible guide to the future" (Itzkoff, 1970). In anthropology where the term was first used, the concept was used most frequently in connection with social stratification theory to analyze relationships among ethnic groups in former colonial countries and to distinguish a plural society from the homogeneous or heterogeneous society (Smith, 1965; Rubin, 1960; Despres, 1968). The term eventually has been adapted and used in other fields.

A widely accepted definition which was used in the 1970's was developed by the National Association for Cultural Pluralism (Suzuki, 1984). It states:

> Cultural pluralism is a state of equal co-existence in a mutually supportive relationship within the boundaries or framework of one nation of people of diverse cultures with significantly different patterns of belief, behavior, color, and in many cases with different languages. To achieve cultural pluralism, there must be unity with diversity. Each be aware of and secure in his own identity, and be willing to extend to others the same respect and rights that he expects to enjoy himself. (Hazard and Stent, 1973)

This definition has its critics. As Suzuki (1984) points out, there is an implication in the definition that the subculture of an ethnic group plays the central role in determining that group's relationship to the larger society and "that the problems of racism, sexism and class inequality will somehow disappear if the various ethnic subcultures in the society are able to equally coexist." (p 100).

It ignores the complex influences such as socio-historical forces, the society's social structure and the position of the ethnic group in that structure (Newman, 1973; Schermmerhorn, 1970). Suzuki further states that this definition ignores the dialectic between the particular aspects of an ethnic subculture and the universal aspects of the larger common culture and promotes a cultural relativism according to which all aspects of every ethnic subculture are seen as worth maintaining and respecting. Finally, Suzuki states, that implied in this definition is that the changes necessary to reach the desired state of cultural pluralism can be achieved within the context of the existing social structure. Ignored is strong influence of societal structures on the development and interactions of the various subcultures that constitute that society. Despite his criticisms, Suzuki would not suggest abandoning the concept of cultural pluralism. Rather he suggests that the concept be expanded beyond culture and attempt to describe alternative social structures that would be more compatible with a culturally pluralistic society (1984).

Such a critical examination of the language of cultural pluralism has led to an expansion of the concept. One of the more current writers, James Lynch (1986), a multicultural educator in England, describes a concept of democratic cultural pluralism:

> ... commitment to the existence of different legitimate cultural groups as legally sanctioned entities which maintain some separate structures and some structures held in common with all groups in society. Such groups are recognized as legitimate categories for the allocation of economic rewards and political power. The principles of such a society are those associated with pursuit of rationality, respect for persons, commitment to discourse for the resolution of conflict, encouragement for human emancipation and freedom, including the freedom to choose to be or not to be a member of a particular cultural group, acceptance of equality before the law and mutuality of instrumental regulation, acceptance of negotiated common values and structures and commitment to political unity at the level of the nation state, combined with engagement for the above values globally. (p.15)

This concept, democratic cultural pluralism, builds on the previous definitions. It includes the issues of power, both economic and political and moves the discourse beyond one of culture. This development in theory in the area of multiculturalism is also reflected in the field of multicultural education. It can be seen in the widening of the scope of referent groups and in the studies of the approaches taken to multicultural education.

Issues of Inclusion

An area of confusion in our understanding of cultural pluralism which impacts on the inclusion of multiculturalism in teacher education centers on which groups are to be included in the diversity implied by multiculturalism (Appleton, 1983). As Richard Pratte (1972) points out, "human groups do not exist in nature, or rather, the part of difference that exists because of nature is unimportant." (p. iv) In other words, people make the distinctions of what makes a group. Sex, age, skin color, beliefs, heritage, physical handicaps, sexual orientation, language, and religion are just some of the ways people group themselves or are grouped by others. Diversity signifies a decision on somebody's part to single out different factors in the group (Appleton, 1983).

Initially, social, political, economic, and educational disadvantages attributable to racial identity and related oppression were the driving forces of the conceptions of multicultural education (Gay, 1992). As theory in the field developed, however, there has been a broadening of the definitional parameters of multicultural education by expanding the referent groups to be included. Now more varied bases of oppression are evoked in contemporary dialogues including: gender, age, handicapping

conditions, social class, religion, national origin, global location, regionality and sexual orientation (Gollnick and Chinn, 198 , Sleeter and Grant, 1988; Banks and Banks, 1989).

The reasons given for the inclusion of the many different groups are strongly influenced by sociological analyses and appeal to shared bonds of social and educational exclusion (Gay, 1992). Several writers (Suzuki, 1984; Sleeter and Grant, 1988) argue that sexism, racism, and classism cannot be fully understood or resolved by treating them as separate phenomena. People are all members of a gender, a social class, and a racial group. Separating the issues is often somewhat artificial. Coalescing also guards against a kind of chauvinism that can result when issues of racism, classism and sexism are all dealt with separately (Sleeter and Grant, 1988).

This all-inclusive conception of multicultural education is not without problems. Leading critic, Geneva Gay (1992), asks the question, how much can be included under the rubric of multicultural education without the concept losing its focus? On a different level she asks, how can school practitioners manage all of these constituent groups and issues under one conceptual framework with the depth and integrity that each deserves? She offers three caveats regarding the all-inclusiveness in the contemporary discourse in multicultural education. First, it may inadvertently cause attention to be distracted from those deep-seated troublesome issues and effects of the racist legacy in the United States. Second, it may give skeptics excuses or opportunities to perpetuate the status quo, in that they could claim that their special education programs simultaneously meet the obligation to do multicultural education. Finally, the substantive focus may emphasize oppression to the exclusion of other elements of cultural diversity.

This debate over the inclusivity of referent groups is important to a study on definitions and perceptions of multiculturalism. As stated before, it aids in understanding the parameters of the definitions someone is using. Equally important in capturing the perceptions of multiculturalism are the goals a person has in mind.

Approaches to Incorporating Multiculturalism in Education

The approach one takes to incorporate multiculturalism into the curriculum involves the goals one has in mind and answers the question "Why?" Why is it being included? To what end? An examination of goals is important to a study of perceptions because as Rokeach (1968) states beliefs can only be inferred from what people say, intend and do. A discussion of goals aids in identifying the intentions of a person.

In an effort to increase conceptual clarity, extensive searches of the literature have been conducted, and several typologies which categorize the approaches taken by writers have been developed (Gibson, 1976; Grant & Sleeter, 1985, 1994). A third typology was developed along philosophical lines through the use of a normative policy argument (Pratte, 1984). The early typologies developed by Gibson and Pratte each identified four approaches in the literature, with Gibson suggesting a fifth. Although the approaches identified by Gibson and Pratte do not correlate exactly, they are conceptually similar. Both limited their searches of the literature to writings related to the descriptors race and cultural diversity (Sleeter & Grant, 1994).

A later typology fleshed out by Sleeter and Grant (1985) identified five approaches, several which are similar to the two earlier typologies. More comprehensive than the first two, and consistent with the developing inclusive definitions, Sleeter and Grant included studies related to gender, social class, sexual orientation, handicapping, and social justice. They also included descriptions of the historical and theoretical foundations undergirding each approach. A brief description of the typology developed by Sleeter and Grant follows with references to the earlier two typologies.

The first approach, teaching the exceptional and culturally diverse, has as its goal the facilitation of the entry of students who are not White, do not speak English, are from low-income homes, or are disabled or are otherwise discriminated against into the mainstream culture . Advocates to this approach want to assist students in bridging whatever deficiencies or differences they have so that they will be successful in school and better meet the demands of traditional American life. This would include the provision of services such as English as a Second Language programs, transitional bilingual classes, remedial and compensatory education classes. Gibson's first approach and Pratte's first and second correspond with this approach.

Whereas the first approach is concerned primarily with the cognitive aspects of learning, the second approach, human relations, has more of an affective or humanistic focus. Advocates of this approach are interested mainly in two things: promoting feelings of unity, tolerance, and acceptance within the existing social structure, and promoting positive feelings among students, reducing stereotyping and promoting students' self-concepts within the school setting. Curriculum programs include lessons about stereotyping and name-calling, lessons about individual differences and similarities, and lessons about contributions of groups of which students are members. Gibson's second approach is similar to this.

Rather than the global emphasis in the human relations approach, the third approach, single-group studies, is more focused. The goals for this approach are to promote social structural equality for and immediate recognition of the identified group. Students would learn about the culture of the particular group taught from the perspective of that group, become aware of how the group has been victimized and with the knowledge of current social issues facing the group, work toward social change which would benefit the identified group. A portion of Pratte's second approach is like Sleeter and Grant's third approach.

The fourth approach, multicultural education differs from the first three approaches in that the emphasis is on total school reform. Advocates of this approach support curriculum changes that retain basic concepts of each discipline but that draw from the experiences of diverse cultural groups to elaborate on those concepts. The goals of this approach are to promote social structural equality and cultural pluralism, respect for those who differ and support for power equity among groups. Curriculum is organized around the contributions and perspectives of several different groups and critical thinking and analysis of alternative viewpoints is encouraged. Use of more than one language would be promoted and the curriculum would be relevant to students' experiential backgrounds. Gibson's fourth and fifth approach corresponds to this fourth approach, as does Pratte's third approach.

Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist is the fifth approach in this typology. This approach deals more directly with oppression and social inequities related to race, class gender and exceptionality than do the goals of the other approaches. The goals are similar to those of the fourth approach, multicultural education, in that advocates seek to promote social structural equality and cultural pluralism. The difference is the addition of the goal of preparing citizens to work actively toward those ends. The content of the curriculum builds upon the curriculum of the fourth approach with the addition of the content being organized around current social issues involving racism, classism, sexism, and handicapism. Social action skills and empowerment skills are also taught and the importance of forming coalitions across racial, ethnic, class and gender lines is stressed. Pratte's fourth approach leans into this last approach.

Despite the varying definitions and approaches in the field, Banks (1993) and Gay (1992) have pointed out that among the major theorists in the field of multicultural education there is increasingly a higher level of consensus about the aims and scope of multicultural education (Banks, 1989; Bennett,

1990; Nieto, 1992; Parekh, 1986; Sleeter & Grant 1988; Suzuki, 1984). The consensus appears to focus around the fourth and fifth approaches in the Sleeter and Grant typology and mirrors the ever-evolving definition of cultural pluralism. An example of such a definition can be seen in the work of Sonia Nieto where multicultural education is:

> A process of comprehensive and basic education for all students. Multicultural education challenges and rejects racism and other forms of discrimination in schools and society and accepts and affirms pluralism (ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious, economic, gender, etc.) that students, their communities, and teachers represent. Multicultural education permeates the curriculum and instructional strategies used in schools, as well as the interactions among teachers, students, parents, and the very way that schools conceptualize the nature of teaching and learning. Because it uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (praxis) as the basis for social change, multicultural education furthers the democratic principles of social justice. (Nieto, 1992 p.307).

Lack of Research in Teacher Education

Despite the fact that multiculturalism is being included in teacher education curriculum at many universities (Gollnick, 1992), there is very little empirical research in the multicultural or curriculum literature which sheds light on infusion into the existing curriculum in colleges of education. Most of what has been written has been theory written on the ideal level and mandates and program descriptions written on formal level of the curriculum. Using Goodlad's framework to examine the small body of research that exists, three only studies focus on the experiential level (Grant, 1981; Grant and Koskela, 1985; Messner, 1993) and two studies (Burcalow, 1984; Wahl, 1990) have been conducted which examine the formal or perceived level of curriculum.

The two studies which examine perceptions or beliefs of teacher educators as they relate to multicultural education did so using survey research. In the earlier study (Burcalow, 1984), questionnaires were mailed to forty-six deans and one-hundred-ninety faculty members at NCATE-accredited institutions. One of the threefold purposes of the study was to determine the perceptions of teacher educators regarding multicultural education. These perceptions, measured using a paper and pencil type measure were then categorized using the typology of five approaches to multicultural education suggested by Gibson (1976). It was found that the most common approach teacher educators were taking toward multiculturalism was an approach Burcalow calls Cultural Understanding. People who take this approach interpret multiculturalism in terms of broad perspectives of cultural understanding and fostering of attitudes.

The other study (Wahl, 1990) utilized semi-structured interviews of 25 faculty and administrators at a midwestern teachers college to examine the meaning of multiculturalism in a specific college of education. Faculty and administrators revealed a wealth of knowledge and wisdom about human understanding and the importance of multicultural ideals. The perceptions of the faculty conveyed a strong notion that educational change towards multiculturalism was crucial, but they did not perceive the hegemonic forces that inhibit change.

In both of these studies, teacher educator perceptions were a part, not the focus, of the study. This study will focus totally on those perceptions of teacher educators hold regarding the inclusion of multiculturalism in the curriculum.

Methodology

Research Approach

This phase of the study consisted of a cross-sectional survey. Accordingly, information was collected from a predetermined sample using face-to-face interviews to gather data. A qualitative analysis of the data then followed.

Selection of Participants

Purposeful sampling was used to determine the participants. The targeted participants were full-time tenure track professors teaching required certification courses in foundations, methods, and educational psychology. Teacher educators who were currently teaching courses in multicultural education were not included in the sample.

The list of required classes for institutional endorsement was obtained from each of the two universities. The distribution of coursework was examined and the number of professors contacted for participation in the study reflected this distribution. In other words, because most of the required courses are methods classes, the majority of the professors contacted was those professors who teach those types of classes. Fewer professors were interviewed in the areas of foundations and educational psychology. Professors were picked using their names from the schedule of classes.

An inside informant at each institution aided in gaining access to the site. The researcher visited each campus to contact possible participants in person. An initial visit before the actual interview aids in the selection of participants and helps build a foundation for the interview relationship (Seidman, 1991, p37). A follow-up letter was sent to professors explaining the research and confirming appointments set up for interviews. The interviews were conducted between April - June 1993. Interviews ranged in time from 30 minutes to one hour; the modal length was about 40 minutes. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Setting

This study was conducted at the colleges of education at two large southwestern universities during the 1993 Spring and Summer sessions. The universities are part of the same state university system. For study purposes, the universities will be referenced as Southern University and Northern University. It should be noted that neither institution is a part of NCATE, due to a unilateral decision of all of the state universities made in 1992 to disassociate with NCATE. However, both were NCATE accredited during the time that the multicultural standards were in effect and multiculturalism is part of the mission statements in the colleges of education and/or in departmental mission statements.

Participants

Ten professors at two separate universities located in the Southwest participated in the study. Within the past year, all of them had taught at least one course required for elementary education certification. A total of two full professors, ten associate professors, six assistant professors and two lecturers were interviewed. Twelve were women and seven were men. Along departmental lines, 2 professors in educational psychology, 3 professors who teach foundations and 15 professors who teach methods and curriculum courses participated in the study.

Data Collection

Questions about multiculturalism are considered by some educators to be threatening. People may give answers which they perceive to be pleasing to the researcher, which present themselves in a

positive light while masking their true feelings or thoughts. This tendency to give inaccurate or incorrect responses is a "response effect." The research of Sudman and Bradburn (1974) revealed that the most important factor in minimizing response effects is the design of the interview format. When planning an interview in which sensitive or threatening topics are covered, open-ended questions using a long introduction to the topic and wording familiar to the respondent obtained much higher-level reporting and smaller response effects than short, closed-form, standard questions (Sudman and Bradburn as cited in Borg and Gall, 1989). This was taken into account by the researcher when designing the interview protocol. Before a question was asked, a scripted introduction was given. The question was asked in an open-ended manner as suggested by Sudman and Bradburn, and several questions were used as probes. The interview protocol was then piloted on several participants at another university. The interview guide and script are appended.

Data Analysis

Transcribing interviews required three months and yielded more than 200 pages of data. Initially each transcript was systematically reviewed looking specifically for three types of articulated information: 1)) definitions of multiculturalism , 2) the approach the person took toward multiculturalism, and 3) the referent groups included in definitions.

When that analysis was concluded, the data was then analyzed inductively using open coding (Strauss, 1988). Some initial categories emerged and several assertions were developed and checked across all interviews.

Report of Findings

Definitions of Multiculturalism

Ten of the teacher educators articulated definitions which reflected the definitions of cultural pluralism used in the 1970s. There was no mention of the positionality of groups, issues of power, nor mention of changing the existing social structure which is more common in the definitions today. An example of a definition given by one of these ten teacher educators is:

> Basically I see multiculturalism highlighting the fact that many cultures exist and that each is all right and acceptable. There is an acknowledgement, an acceptance, and a respect. It's a perceptive consciousness; not everyone sees the world the way I do and that is ok. The other part is the commitment to try to bridge the gaps between our cultures.

One of the participants did speak about teaching politically. Her answer leaned into a definition of democratic cultural pluralism. Five gave answers which were non-classifiable. An example of this type of answer is, "It's a friendly word." Five of the professors didn't answer the question. They talked around it but did not give definitions.

Approaches to Multicultural Education

Approaches people take toward a concept such as multicultural education are helpful in making inferences about what their intentions are, which in turn helps in determining their perceptions or beliefs. Several approaches to multicultural education were evident in the data.

Nine of the participants gave answers which most nearly fit Sleeter and Grant's (1988) human relations approach and Gibson's (1976) education about cultural differences or cultural understanding approach. A typical response was, "It is to become productive and to get along; to know each other and to know how to work with each other." Four teacher educators articulated Sleeter and Grant's

(1988) multicultural approach. Three professors spoke of goals which reflected a mixture of a human relations approach and the multicultural approach. One stated:

> We need to get along and accept each other. We need to commit to bridge the gap between groups. Teachers need to know this and do it. They also need to pay attention to equity issues, power, and they need to develop a social conscience. We need to teach about stereotyping, gender, physiology, prejudice and just as importantly, traditions, rituals, and folkways.

One professor came close to expressing the viewpoint of education which is multicultural and social reconstructionist:

> My goal for education is that society has to be a place where everybody has chances and real opportunities. I want schooling for change, great transformation. If you want to call it revolution, that is ok too. I don't use that word around here a lot because too many people are afraid of it. Education has not made a difference for the people who need it most. That is because we don't recognize them as a part of the goal of education today. We need to face people with their own racist attitudes. Hmmm... no, maybe the first thing we need to do is teach ourselves. Look at what we do to support racism, linguistic bias and classism among teachers. I think that the faculty has always to be involved rethinking what they believe about diversity of the country.

Finally, one person articulated goals which were similar to the teaching of the exceptional and culturally diverse and two answered in ways that were unclassifiable.

Referent Groups

The number of groups included in most teacher educators' definitions was less than those included in the definitions of the multiculturalists in the field of multicultural education. Every participant included Mexican-American and Native-American issues and the related linguistic issues in their discussion of multiculturalism. The next most common group they included was women. The terms "global," "social class," "race," "religion," and "handicap" came up in descending order. No one mentioned sexual orientation in the initial round of interviews.

Preliminary Assertions

After the initial analysis of the transcripts, clean transcripts of the same interviews were analyzed using open coding. Through this use of open coding, several assertions began to emerge from the data. Given that only one type of data had been collected and only one type of analysis had been conducted, any assertions made could at best be said to be developing. Four assertions were identified. These assertions were considered further in the data analysis of the multiple case study. They are:

Assertion #1

Multiculturalism may be included in the curriculum under a different term or through the use of different language.

This can be seen in the language some of the teacher educators used to discuss diversity. Several avoided the word. Others focused on specific words. One professor emphasized context. Another professor, on the other hand talks about interculturalism:

> You need to know that I have a problem thinking about multiculturalism. I prefer to think of interculturalism. And the reason I like to think like that is because

> multiculturalism separates and it looks at different cultures externally. Interculturalism looks at how do you bring diverse groups together to function as a cultural unit within the social context you have presented. Intercultural is my umbrella term, and multicultural is one of many terms underneath it. It's only a part of my focus. It is a contributing component.

One person emphasizes human dignity:

> I don't care what multicultural people are concerned with at all. I am concerned that human beings are treated with human dignity, respect regardless of one's culture and standard. That every human being have an opportunity to fulfill his greatest potential in society ... So human dignity, everyone warrants it, personal time, everybody deserves it. That is my feeling for multicultural education. It is not for one culture, it is not for one ethnic group, it is not for more for one than for another, it is for the human being.

Assertion #2

When teacher educators address multiculturalism, the referent groups which they include in their coursework reflects the diversity of the local area.

Many of the teacher educators saw the state where they live as having a diverse population. Statements were made by five people, expressing the opinion that teacher educators could not live in that state and not realize that they had to address diversity in the classroom. When the topics being included under the teacher educators definition are examined, it appears that what they discuss and include in their definitions reflects the salient groups in that particular state. Native-American and Latino issues as they relate to culture and linguistic diversity were foremost in the discussion of multiculturalism with gender and class also being mentioned. The word "race" only appeared in five transcripts and it was not a major descriptor used by any participant.

Assertion #3

Teacher educators address multiculturalism from various levels of involvement.

When the participants were asked for their thoughts on the best way to prepare future teachers to meet the reality of a diverse classroom, nine responded that field experience in diverse settings was crucial. Six began by talking about coursework, particularly whether a separate course should be offered or whether infusion should occur. The remaining five professors interviewed answered that question in a very different way. They automatically started talking about what they do, giving examples, talking in a very personal way:

> I think preservice teachers need to see things modeled and talk about the model they see. If we just talk about it and don't model it, I don't think we will accomplish anything.... I personally feel that I have been addressing diversity for years and it wasn't because of race. There are other rules of diversity in cultures ... Cultural awareness is part of my life and who I am as a teacher.

She continues,

> People who are working in the Center for Native-American Cultural Diversity and those sorts of jobs will probably not agree with me. They would feel that my German, Lutheran background is not the same and should not be the same level of teaching. If they heard me say that we are all equal, they would disagree. But my background, who I

came from, and the cultural diversity I bring to my technology classes is just as important to my classroom as well as theirs.

Perhaps one of the oldest and most experienced teacher educators responded:

To me, I can't teach any course where I don't focus on people who are different from each other ... different backgrounds, cultures, and languages. That can be the center of every course I teach even though I am focusing on different kinds of things. I do and am very committed to that... Everything I teach is multiculturalism because I think it is so ultra basic.

An educational psychologist answered:

I look at all of the textbooks in my field and I choose my textbooks for my courses very carefully. I am aware of who I am and how my personality and my own social and cultural background influences the way I teach. I try to help my students to see that in themselves.

There was no pattern for this response along the lines of institution, gender, ethnicity, race, class, etc. as to who was speaking in this way.

Assertion #4

There appears to be a perception that multiculturalism stands for difference only.

Most people had a positive reaction to multiculturalism, however, some found it to be problematic. The fact that they found the term problematic did not necessarily mean that they were against the concept. There were people on both sides of the argument who critiqued the concept:

One of my problems with multiculturalism is we are always trying to look at our differences and forget that we all are human and that our similarities are just as important as our differences. So, we need to be aware of the differences of who we are and at the same time we need to be aware of our similarities.

Another answered:

It is divisive and very bad for the country.

There was quite a bit of talk in various interviews that there is a need to find the similarities among ourselves. This may possibly also be linked to the view of multiculturalism addressing only difference. This assertion may be linked to the first assertion as to why certain people avoid the language of multiculturalism.

Conclusion

As stated before, this study was only the first phase, or perhaps it would be more aptly called the exploratory stage of a larger study which examines the perceptions of teacher educators relating to multiculturalism. The larger study includes further in-depth interviews and observations and document reviews of five of the participants of this study.

The implication of the findings of this study address social and educational issues at several different levels of education. How teacher educators interpret and model multiculturalism in their classes will ultimately impact on the future teachers sitting in their classrooms, which in turn has an effect on secondary and elementary schools.

Perceptions, especially those of the people involved, are very important to curricular transformation. If we are sincere in our desire to change curriculum to reflect a multicultural perspective, we need to get beyond mandates and writing program descriptions. More research needs to be conducted in this area and multiple conceptual , theoretical frameworks need to be employed in the analysis of the data.

This study suggests that the perceptions that teacher educators hold of multiculturalism most reflect a human relations approach to multiculturalism. This conceptualization includes looking at similarities, differences, getting to know ourselves, and addressing stereotypes and prejudices. All of this is very important but lacks any kind of answers as to how to address uneven achievement in schools along, racial, gender, and class lines. It has been suggested by the researcher that one of the ways to expand the discourse in a college of education is to recruit faculty who hold different viewpoints. It is not enough to have experience in diverse placements and give voice to a global view of multiculturalism.

Being a pragmatist, I believe change is going to come slowly and in order for it occur, it must occur in stages. These stages are not necessarily linear. We have gone through the stage of the mandates. Now we need to work on lessening the gap between the theory and the practice.

Limitations of the Study

A problem exists when beliefs or perceptions are inferred from only one source of data such as the participants' self-report on a survey or in an interview. Rokeach (1968), cautioned that understanding beliefs requires making inferences about individuals' underlying states. Such inferences are fraught with difficulty because individuals are often unable or unwilling, for many reasons, to accurately represent their beliefs. For this reason, beliefs cannot be directly observed or measured but must be inferred from what people say, intend, and do. Thus reliance on self report or interviews, at best, only allows for a partial picture of what someone's perceptions or beliefs may be.

Another limitation is the lenses of the researcher. My own definitions may color the way I am interpreting what I am hearing. I have biases such as that there is a need for a systemic change in higher education if social justice is to be achieved. I also believe that multicultural infusion is very problematic.

A final limitation would be that this group of participants does not necessarily represent the whole faculty in colleges of education of the two universities. Other professors teach courses in the teacher preparation program and may have different perceptions of multiculturalism. Other approaches to multiculturalism may very well be present on the faculty. The purpose of this study was not to focus on an institution but rather to listen to the voices of those who will do the curriculum transformation.

REFERENCES

AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education. (1973). No one model American. Journal of Teacher Education, 24, 264-265.

Appleton, N. (1983). Cultural pluralism in education: Theoretical foundations. New York: Longman.

Banks, J. A. (1993). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. Review of Research in Education, 63, 3-49.

Banks, J. A. & Banks, C. A. M. (1993). Multicultural education; Issues and perspectives (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Baptiste, H. P. (1977). Multicultural education evolvement at the University of Houston: a case study. In FH. Klassen and D.M. Gollnick (Eds.), Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and Case studies. Washington, DC: American Association of colleges for TeacherEducation.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Burcalow, J.V. (1984). Teacher educators' perceptions and practices pertaining to multicultural teacher education.Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American EducationalAssociation, New Orleans.

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, F., Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond the surface curriculum. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Buttery, T.J., Haberman, & M. Houston, W.R. (1990). First annual ATE survey of critical issues in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 12, 1-7.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research in teaching. In Handbook of research on teaching, edited by M.C. Wittrock, 119-161. New York: Macmillan.

Gay, G. (1992). The state of multicultural education in the United States. In K. Adam-Moodley (Ed), Education in plural societies: International perspectives. (pp. 47-66). Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Detselig.

Gay, G. (1971). Ethnic minority studies: How widespread? How successful? Educational Leadership, 29, 108-112.

Gibson, M. A. (1976). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 7, 7-18.

Gollnick, D.M. (1992). Multicultural education: Policies and practices in teacher education. In Research & multicultural education: From the margins to the mainstream, edited by C.A.Grant, 218-239. London: Falmer Press.

Gollnick, D.M. Chinn P. C. (1994). Multicultural education in a pluralistic society. New York: Merrill.

Goodlad, J. (1977). What goes on in our schools. EducationalResearcher, 6, 3-6.

Grant, C. A. (1978). Education that is multicultural--Isn't that what we mean? Journal of Teacher Education, 29, 45-49.

Grant, C. A. (1981). Education that is multicultural and teachers preparation: An examination from the perspective of preservice teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 95-99.

Grant, C. & Koskela, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. Journal of Educational Research, 79, 197-203.

Grant, C. A. & Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Race, class, and gender in educational research: an argument for integrative analysis. Review of Educational Research, 56, 195-211.

Grant, C. & Secada, W.G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity, in Houston, W.R. (Ed.) Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, New York: Macmillan Pubs.

Harzard, W.R. & Stent, M.D. (1973) Cultural pluralism and schooling: Some preliminary observations, In M.D. Stent et al., Cultural pluralism in education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989) Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Association, 26, 160-190.

Itzkoff, S.W. (1970). Cultural pluralism and American education. Scranton,PA: International Textbook Co.

Lynch, J. (1986). Multicultural education: Principles and practice. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Messner, K. A. (1993). Multiculturalism in the professional studies or Pardon me I believe your values may be showing.Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Munby, H. (1984) A qualitative study of teachers' beliefs and principles. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21, 27-83.

This college of education has a commitment to multiculturalism and multicultural education clearly stated in its mission statement.

10. What kinds of responses from teacher educators have you heard about this commitment?

11. What factors here at the university facilitate the inclusion of multiculturalism in the curriculum?

12. What do you believe might be the greatest problem in implementing multiculturalism into teacher education?

In the fall, I may be taking a job at a university where I will be working with faculty members to incorporate multiculturalism into their courses.

21hat advice would you give me as junior faculty working with faculty in that capacity?

Well this concludes my questions. Is there anything else you would like to add or say?

Thank you very much for your time.

Phase 1 Questions

1. Will you please share with me a little about yourself. Where are you from originally? Where have you gone to school?

2. Have you taught K-12? Where? How long?

3. Where and how long have you been a teacher educator?

4. What courses are you presently teaching here at _____?

5. What are your research interests?

Now we are going to shift gears a little bit. As you may know the demographics in our country are changing and the student population in our nation's schools are becoming more diverse.

6. Given this increasing cultural diversity in our schools, what do you believe is the best way colleges of education can prepare preservice teachers to meet this reality in the classroom?

Possible Probes

A. Where do you believe multiculturalism should be addressed in the teacher education curriculum?

B. Who should be addressing it?

C. Will you expand on that a bit?

D. Do you incorporate multiculturalism in your courses?

E. Would you describe for me something you do in your class that is an example of this incorporation of multiculturalism?

One of the features of multiculturalism is the lack of a universal definition of the concept. I'd like to explore this with you.

7. What would be an "off the cuff" definition of multiculturalism which you might share?

There is not overall agreement among multicultural educators about what should be the purpose of multicultural education and what should be included under this rubric.

8. Why do you believe multicultural education should be incorporated into teacher education?
9. What topics do you believe should be included in multicultural education?

Interview Protocol

Script:

The purpose of my research is to look at multiculturalism and multicultural education from the viewpoint of teacher educators. Many colleges of education are including multiculturalism in their mission statements. Multicultural education is mandated by certain agencies and many states. In my search of literature on the subject however, I have found that most of the literature on the subject is theory and program descriptions. The voices of teacher educators conspicuously absent.

For my research I need a broad perspective of the thoughts and feelings, and the observations of teacher educators about the concepts of multiculturalism and multicultural education.

I appreciate your willingness to speak to me. This will be an informal semi-structured interview. I have a list of questions, but feel free to interrupt at any time with any information that you feel is important. I want to assure you of absolute anonymity. This research is being conducted on two college campuses. The data will be compiled in a process of analytic induction and no individual will be identified with their particular point of view. If you feel uncomfortable at any time, the interview will stop.

To help me analyze the data from my interviews, I would like to tape record the interview so that I may analyze the transcripts. Again, your name would not be attached to the tape. I will be using a coding system to identify participants to further reduce the possibility of any loss of anonymity. If at any time you wish to stop the tape or delete part of it, I will be more than happy to comply. Do I have your permission to tape this interview?

NCATE (1990) NCATE Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units, Washington DC, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Newman, W.M. (1973). American pluralism. New York: Harper and Row.

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity. New York: Longman

Olson, J. K. (1981). Teacher influence in the classroom. Instructional Science, 10, 259-275.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 307-332.

Parekh, B. (1986). The concept of multicultural education. In S. Modgil, G. Verma, K. Mallick, & C. Modgil (Eds.), Multicultural education: The interminable debate (pp. 19-31), Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Posner, G. J. (1982). A cognitive science conception of curriculum and instruction. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 14, 343-351.

Pratte, R. (1983)Multicultural education: Four normative arguments. Educational Researcher, 33 21-32.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. Educational Researcher, 19 10-18.

Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.

Schermerhorn, R.A. (1970). Comparative ethnic relations: A framework for theory and research. New York: Random House.

Sleeter, C. E. & Grant, C. A. (1994). Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender. New York: Merrill.

Smith, R.T. (1961). Book review: Social and cultural pluralism in the Caribbean. American Anthropologist, 155, 63.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking Questions: A practical guide to questionnaire design. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suzuki, B. H. (1984). Curriculum transformation for multicultural education. Education and Urban Society, 16, 294-322.

Wahl, J. B. (1990). Reconceptualizing a teachers college from eurocentric to multicultural. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Nebraska.